

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10-14, 16, 17 and 20-23 have been amended to correct formality errors and to more clearly define the invention.

The claims have been amended to more clearly define that the claimed system is used for automated generation of installation instructions for an executable software application involving deriving installation related information *supporting data exchange between different systems* from configuration data associated with the application". Support for this and the other amendments is found in the existing claims and in the Application description on page 6 lines 3-23.

*I. Objection to Claim 14.*

Claim 14 is objected to because of reciting "the storage medium is a portable medium comprising removable magnetic media, removable optical media, and removable solid state media". Claim 14 is amended to remove all reference to storage media and consequently this ground is no longer deemed applicable.

*II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)*

Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 13, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,434,598 – Gish. These claims, as amended, are deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Amended claim 1 recites a method for "automated generation of installation instructions for an executable software application, comprising: retrieving template installation instruction information from a persistent data store; deriving installation related information supporting data exchange between different systems from configuration data associated with the application; incorporating the derived installation related information into the template installation information to form installation instruction data; and storing the derived installation instruction data". These features are not shown (or suggested) in Gish.

The "automated" generation of installation instructions for an executable software application of amended claim 1 involves "deriving installation related information supporting data exchange between different systems from configuration data associated with the application" and "incorporating the derived installation

related information” into “template installation information to form installation instruction data”. These features enable the provision of “up-to-date documentation” that “substantially eliminates the possibility that documentation” does “not match the interface”, lessens the “possibility that installation documentation will get misplaced or destroyed” and allows “an installer of interfaces to automatically create real-time documentation reflecting all changes, substantially eliminating the cost of installation documentation distribution” (Application page 7 line 9 to page 8 line 2).

In contrast the system of Gish “relates to improvements in computer systems and, more particularly, to operating system software for managing Interprise computing in a network user interface” (Gish column 1 lines 18-22). The Gish system does not show or suggest “deriving installation related information supporting data exchange between different systems from configuration data associated with the application” and “incorporating the derived installation related information” into “template installation information to form installation instruction data”. Gish does not show “**automated**” generation of “installation instructions for an executable software application” at all.

Contrary to the Rejection statement (on page 3 and elsewhere), Gish in column 42 lines 1-67 and column 43 lines 1-39 merely presents a **manual** process a **user** employs to compile a C++ program using a “makefile (Example.mk)” (column 42 line 1). This is evidenced by the instructions to the user throughout (“modify it to specify the: Compiler location” column 42 line 6, “Open Example.mk in an editor and follow the instructions in the file” column 42 lines 12-13, “Supply the locations of the compiler” column 42 line 14, “The macros for which you provide values” column 42 lines 22-23, “Change the following line to indicate the location of the ICET installation # directory” column 42 lines 35-36, also see lines 44, 57, 65, column 43 lines 1, 18 31, for example). This manual process is well known to C++ programmers and does not show or suggest, and has no bearing on, “**automated**” generation of “installation instructions for an executable software application”. The manual process involves use of an “installation directory” (e.g., column 42 line 3) but is not relevant to “automated” generation of “installation instructions for an executable software application”. The “Example.mk file” of Gish (column 42 line 1) is a makefile providing instructions for “Building an ICE-T application” by “modifying” the “make file for the client and server programs, and then using it to make both programs” (Gish column 41 lines 65-67). The “Example.mk file” makefile of Gish does not show or suggest “installation related information” supporting “**data exchange** between **different systems** from configuration data associated with the

application” and does not show or suggest “**automated**” generation of such “installation related information” for “an executable software application”. The “Example.mk file” makefile of Gish gives **manual** instructions to be followed by a **user** (“Open Example.mk in an editor and follow the instructions in the file”, column 42 lines 12-13).

Gish nowhere shows or suggests “deriving **installation** related information supporting **data exchange** between **different systems** from configuration data associated with the application”. In addition since Gish addresses improving “computer systems” and “operating system software for managing Interprise computing in a network user interface” and NOT the specific problems involved in providing “up-to-date documentation” for use in application and interface installation, there is no problem recognition, other motivation or reason for Gish to incorporate the claimed features. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 2 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Gish does not show (or suggest) a method involving “extracting installation data supporting data exchange between different systems from the configuration data, the installation data comprising at least two of:...an identity of a directory to contain the application; ...an identity of data files comprising the application;...an identity of a communication protocol to be used by the application;...communication settings for the application;...suggested performance enhancement settings for the application; and...prompting questions to be answered by a user upon installation of the application”. As previously explained Gish does not show “**automated**” generation of “installation instructions for an executable software application” at all or contemplate “extracting installation data supporting **data exchange** between different systems from the **configuration** data”. Gish also does not show or suggest “extracting installation data” comprising “at least two of:...an identity of a directory to contain the application; ...an identity of data files comprising the application;...an identity of a communication protocol to be used by the application;...communication settings for the application;...suggested performance enhancement settings for the application; and...prompting questions to be answered by a user upon installation of the application”.

Amended dependent claim 3 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 3 is also considered to be patentable because Gish

does not show (or suggest) a method involving “deriving installation related information” for an “executable software application” comprising an “interface application enabling communication” between “different...executable applications”. As previously explained Gish does not show “automated” generation of “installation instructions for an executable software application” at all or contemplate “deriving installation related information” for an “executable software application” comprising an “interface application **enabling communication**” between “**different...executable applications**”.

Amended dependent claim 4 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 4 is also considered to be patentable because Gish does not show (or suggest) a method involving “formatting” the derived installation instruction data” supporting “**data exchange between different systems**” as “installation documentation for reproduction on an output device, the output device comprising a printer and a video display”. Gish does not show or suggest such features.

Amended dependent claim 5 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 5 is also considered to be patentable because Gish does not show (or suggest) a system in which the “derived installation instruction data comprises installation instruction text data for output as installation documentation”. As previously explained Gish does not suggest processing such “installation instruction” supporting “data exchange between different systems” derived “from configuration data associated with the application”.

Amended dependent claim 7 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 7 is also considered to be patentable because Gish does not show (or suggest) a method including “selecting a file containing the template installation instruction information from a plurality of files containing a corresponding plurality of installation instruction documentation templates for interface applications supporting data exchange between different systems”. As previously explained Gish does not suggest processing “installation instruction documentation **templates** for interface applications **supporting data exchange** between different systems”.

Amended dependent claim 11 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 11 is also considered to be patentable because Gish does not show (or suggest) a method including “providing a **map** for associating

items of the derived installation related information and corresponding locations in the template installation information for use in incorporating the derived installation related information into the template installation information and **supporting data exchange between different systems**". The user instruction to indicate a location of a compiler of Gish column 42 and 43 cited in the Rejection page 5 is manual instruction to a user that has no bearing on "**automated**" generation of "installation instructions for an executable software application" or on "providing a **map** for associating **items** of the **derived installation** related information and **corresponding locations** in the template installation information". These features are nowhere suggested in Gish.

Amended dependent claim 13 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 13 is also considered to be patentable because Gish does not show (or suggest) locating "the system for automated generation of installation instruction documentation for an executable software application is located on a storage medium together with the application". As previously explained Gish does not suggest "**automated** generation of installation instruction documentation" including data "**supporting data exchange** between different systems" or "storage" of such "installation instruction documentation" on a "medium **together with** the application".

Dependent claim 15 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 15 is also considered to be patentable because Gish does not show (or suggest) processing "template installation instruction information comprises predetermined text installation instructions **and** an executable procedure for **generating installation** instructions **upon** procedure execution". As previously explained Gish does not suggest "automated" generation of installation instructions at all.

Amended independent claim 23 recites a system for "automated generation of installation instructions for an executable software application" including, "configuration data for a software interface; a template, comprising documentation and data fields to receive one or more configuration data elements; a computer system comprising a memory and a processor; and software executable in the computer system for creating a data file containing installation data supporting data exchange between different systems derived from configuration data and incorporated into the template, the installation data comprising documentation of an installation process for the software interface". Claim 23 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1. Claim 23 is also considered

to be patentable because Gish does not show (or suggest) processing “software executable in the computer system for creating a data file containing installation data supporting data exchange between different systems derived from configuration data”. As previously explained Gish does not suggest such features. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 1-5, 7, 11, 13, 15 and 23 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

### *III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)*

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,434,598 – Gish in view of U.S. Patent 6,336,124 - Alam. These claims, as amended, are considered patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and for the following reasons.

Dependent claim 6 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 5. Claim 6 is also considered to be patentable because Gish in combination with Alam does not suggest a method for “deriving installation related information supporting data exchange between different systems from configuration data associated with the application” wherein the “derived installation instruction data comprise installation instruction text data for output as installation documentation and including the step of “selecting an output format for the installation documentation, the output format comprising Rich Text Format, Microsoft® Word compatible format, HTML document format, and Extensible Mark-up Language (XML) compatible format”. These features are not shown or suggested in Gish in combination with Alam.

Neither Gish nor Alam, individually or together, suggest such features. As previously explained Gish does not suggest “automated generation of installation instruction documentation” including data “supporting data exchange between different systems”. Further, Alam nowhere mentions installation information and Alam, with Gish, fails to suggest “**automated** generation of installation instruction documentation” including data “**supporting data exchange** between different systems”. Alam is concerned with “a method for converting a document stored in one format to a different format. More specifically, a system and method for converting digital data representing an image of a document image stored in one format to other formats for manipulation and display are disclosed” (Alam column 1 lines 16-21). Neither Gish nor Alam, individually or together, are concerned with the specific problems addressed by the claimed arrangement in providing “up-to-date

documentation” for use in application and interface installation and there is no problem recognition, other motivation or reason for Gish with Alam to incorporate the claimed features. Incorporating the document conversion features of Alam in the system of Gish as suggested by the Rejection results in a system for conversion of instructions found in a makefile used in compiling a C++ program, for example, and does not involve “**automated** generation of installation instruction documentation” including data “**supporting data exchange** between different systems”. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

#### *IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)*

Claims 8-10, 16-18 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,434,598 – Gish in view of U.S. Patent 6,560,754 – Hakewill. These claims, as amended, are considered patentable for reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 6 and for the following reasons.

Amended dependent claim 8 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 8 is also considered to be patentable because Gish in combination with Hakewill does not suggest a method for “deriving installation related information supporting data exchange between different systems from configuration data associated with the application” including the step of “creating a prompt question generating routine for inclusion in the installation instruction data by incorporating prompt questions into a predetermined question prompting executable procedure, the prompt questions being for answer by a user upon installation of the application”. These features are not shown or suggested in Gish in combination with Hakewill.

Neither Gish nor Hakewill, individually or together, suggest such features. Hakewill in column 13 lines 16-21 states “In one embodiment of the makefile generation process of the present invention, the **user is interactively asked via display prompts** to input information relating to the desired design such as the type of “build” (e.g., overall device or system configuration), width of the external memory system data bus, different types of extensions, cache type/size, etc.” Consequently, Hakewill discusses use of prompt questions in a process for generating a makefile for compiling an HDL program (the “makefile generated...is run to create the structural HDL” column 13 lines 24-25). Hakewill mentions that a “**user is interactively asked via display prompts**”. However, Hakewill does NOT suggest “creating a prompt question generating **routine** for inclusion in the **installation**

**instruction data** by incorporating prompt questions into a predetermined question prompting **executable procedure**". Further, Hakewill with Gish nowhere suggests this feature in combination with "**automated** generation of installation instruction documentation" including data "**supporting data exchange** between different systems". Hakewill is concerned with "integrated circuit design, specifically to the use of a hardware description language (RDL) for implementing instructions in a pipelined central processing unit (CPU) or user- customizable microprocessor" (Hakewill column 1 lines 36-40). Neither Gish nor Hakewill, individually or together, are concerned with the specific problems addressed by the claimed arrangement in providing "up-to-date documentation" for use in application and interface installation and there is no problem recognition, other motivation or other reason for Gish with Hakewill to incorporate the claimed features. Incorporating the makefile prompt questions of Hakewill in the system of Gish as suggested by the Rejection results in a system for using prompt questions to guide a user in generating a makefile used in compiling a C++ program, for example, and fails to suggest "**automated** generation of installation instruction documentation" including data "**supporting data exchange** between different systems". Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 9 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 8 and for the reasons given in connection with these claims. Claim 9 is also considered to be patentable because Gish in combination with Hakewill does not suggest a method for "deriving installation related information supporting data exchange between different systems from configuration data associated with the application" including generating "prompt questions to be answered by a user upon installation...**derived from the configuration data**" of an application. These features are not shown or suggested in Gish in combination with Hakewill.

Amended dependent claim 10 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 and for the reasons given in connection with these claims. Claim 10 is also considered to be patentable because Gish in combination with Hakewill does not suggest a method for "deriving installation related information supporting data exchange between different systems from configuration data associated with the application" including "**creating prompt question documentation** for inclusion in the installation instruction data, the prompt question being for answer by a user upon installation of an interface application supporting



**data exchange between different systems”**. As previously explained, these features are not shown or suggested by Gish in combination with Hakewill.

Amended independent claim 16 is considered to be patentable for the reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 8. Claim 16 is also considered to be patentable because Gish in combination with Hakewill does not suggest a method for “automated generation of installation instructions for an executable software application” including “retrieving template installation instruction information from a data store, the installation instruction information including prompt questions for answer by a user upon installation of the application; deriving installation related information supporting data exchange between different systems from configuration data associated with the application; incorporating the derived installation related information into the template installation information to form installation instruction data; and presenting the installation instruction data to a user during an installation of the application”. As previously explained Gish with Hakewill does not suggest “**automated** generation of installation instructions for an executable software application” by “retrieving template installation instruction information from a data store, the installation instruction information including **prompt questions** for answer by a user upon installation of the application” in combination with “deriving installation related information supporting **data exchange between different systems** from **configuration data associated with the application**”. These features are nowhere shown or suggested in Gish in combination with Hakewill.

Amended dependent claim 17 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 16 and for the reasons given in connection with claims 1, 8 and 16. Claim 17 is also considered to be patentable because Gish in combination with Hakewill does not suggest a method for “**automated** generation of installation instructions for an executable software application...enabling communication and data exchange between said different systems” that “comprise executable applications to be enabled to communicate using installation data extracted from the configuration data, including at least one of, (a) a communication protocol identifier and (b) communication settings for at least one of said different systems”. These features are not shown or suggested in Gish in combination with Hakewill.

Dependent claim 18 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 16 and for the reasons given in connection with claims 1, 8 and 16. Claim 18 is also considered to be patentable because Gish in combination with Hakewill does not suggest the combination of features of claim 18 involving

“**automated** generation of installation instructions for an executable software application” involving “creating a prompt question generating **procedure** for generating the prompt questions for answer by the user”. These features are not shown or suggested in Gish in combination with Hakewill.

Amended independent claims 20 and 21 are considered to be patentable for the reasons given in connection with claims 1, 8 and 16 and because of the additional feature combinations they represent.

*V. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)*

Claims 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,434,598 – Gish in view of U.S. Patent 5,390,240 – Sensney. These claims, as amended, are considered patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and for the following reasons.

Amended dependent claim 12 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 and for the reasons given in connection with claims 1, 8 and 16. Claim 12 is also considered to be patentable because Gish in combination with Sensney does not suggest a method for “**automated** generation of installation instructions for an executable software application” in which the “executable software application is an interface application used in exchanging data between different systems comprising a first executable application and a different second executable application and further comprising prompting a user to select at least one of the first executable application and the second executable application”. These features are not shown or suggested in Gish in combination with Sensney. Gish with Sensney nowhere suggests such a feature combination involving “prompting a user to select at least one of the first executable application and the second executable application”. Sensney column 9 lines 17-20 (relied on in the Rejection page 12) states “In this example, the technician ...responds to a prompt by entering an access code for the source of the imagery signal and by entering an access code for the destination for the imagery signal”. A prompt to enter an access code for source and destination “**imagery signals**” has no bearing on, and does NOT suggest “**prompting a user to select** at least one of the **first** executable application and the **second** executable application” in a system for “**automated** generation of installation instructions for an executable software application...used in exchanging data between...a first executable application and a different second executable application”.

Dependent claim 19 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 16 and for the reasons given in connection with previous claims.

*VI. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)*

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,434,598 – Gish.

Amended dependent claim 14 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 and for the reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 16 and because of the additional feature combination that it incorporates.

*VII. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)*

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,434,598 – Gish in view of U.S. Patent 6,560,754 – Hakewill and further in view of Sensney U.S. Patent 5,390,240. These claims, as amended, are considered patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and for the following reasons.


Amended dependent claim 22 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 21 and for the reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 16 and because of the additional feature combination that it incorporates.

*IV. Information Disclosure Statement*

Enclosed is an Information Disclosure Statement pursuant to 37 CFR 1.97 including references cited in a search report for a foreign corresponding case. The cited references are not deemed to disturb the patentability of the claims as amended herein.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Alexander J. Burke

Reg. No. 40,425

Alexander J. Burke  
Intellectual Property Department  
Siemens Corporation,  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, N.J. 08830  
Tel. 732 321 3023  
Fax 732 321 3030

**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on 9 March 2004.

Alexander J. Burke  
Alexander J. Burke

9 March 2004  
Date